DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 534 CS 215 495

AUTHOR Watts, Liz; Wernsman, Robert
TITLE College and University Administrators' Views about Serving as News Sources for Student Reporters.
PUB DATE Aug 96
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (79th, Anaheim, CA, August 10-13, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Role; Attitude Measures; College Administration; Higher Education; Questionnaires; *School Newspapers; Student Evaluation; *Student Publications; *Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS Administrator Surveys; Journalists; *News Sources; *Scholastic Journalism

ABSTRACT

Student journalists at colleges and universities routinely interview and quote collegiate administrators for campus-based news stories; however, the role of those administrators as news sources apparently has not been considered. A study examined the role of administrators and their assessment of student journalists. A questionnaire was sent to 5 administrators at each of the 405 colleges and universities listed in the 1994-95 AEJMC (Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication) directory. Of the 1,500 questionnaires mailed, 510 were usable. Respondents represented 334 public and 176 private schools. Results showed that almost 75% of the respondents contacted were regularly used as sources by student journalists. Most respondents had been used as sources during the same month that they answered the questionnaire. Also, 75% said they had never refused to be interviewed. In questions about the quality of student journalism, the administrators gave mostly neutral ratings, indicating the journalists were not especially good or bad. They gave above-average ratings in only two areas: for objectivity and for asking pertinent questions. They gave mid-range ratings to interview preparation, follow-up questions, and knowledge about the topic. They gave low-range ratings for calling back to verify information or to get a post-publication reaction. Results support some already published literature. (Contains 10 tables of data and 29 notes.) (TB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 401 534

College and University Administrators' Views About Serving as News Sources for Student Reporters

By
Liz Watts, Ph.D.
and
Robert Wernsman

School of Mass Communications
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas 79409
WYWAT@TTACS.TTU.EDU
806-742-3160

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Watts
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Submitted to
Mass Communications and Society
AEJMC
Anaheim, California

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS215495

College and University Administrators' Views
About Serving as News Sources for Student Reporters

By
Liz Watts, Ph.D.and Robert Wernsman
Texas Tech University

In Spring 1995 a news writing instructor tipped a student to a good story about the retirement of a dean. The student wrote two stories that were published in the student newspaper, and later the instructor called the dean to get a reaction. The dean, who had just finished a two-hour harangue about incorrect information in one of the stories, had already phoned the newspaper's adviser and editor. The instructor described the incident to colleagues; and their discussion led to the idea of a survey: What do college administrators think about being news sources for student reporters?

Literature Review

Student journalists at colleges and universities routinely interview and quote collegiate administrators for campus-based news stories; however, the role of these administrators as news sources apparently has not been examined. A search of the literature revealed that some aspects of the college media have been studied, but no reports on college administrators' views of the accuracy, bias or saliency of student newspapers were found.

College daily newspapers rely predominantly on campus-oriented news with 40 percent of their total coverage coming from administrative functions, faculty senate meetings, student government proceedings and actions of other campus governing bodies. News about extracurricular student club meetings, social functions, the physical plant and academic honors comprised another 18.5 percent of the coverage.[1]

Students working for their campus newspapers may get their first interviewing experience in questioning deans, provosts, vice presidents and presidents of their respective institutions. However, the student reporters' short tenures on campus and their indecisive actions create problems in establishing source networks and generating faculty and administration rapport. Sources, knowing neither the reputations nor the reliability of their student interviewers, become wary and less cooperative; and misquoted professors or administrators not only have long memories, they have more permanence on campus.[2] Administrators' academic and professional publications that report stories about the student media or suggest ways to manage them may enhance their aggravation.[3]

Peter Flawn writes that university presidents would really not want to be president of a university that did not have a student newspaper. Student publications "add life, color, and excitement to the campus."[4] Yet, he notes, that First Amendment rights have been extended to "the most childish and sophomoric student publications," in newspapers so equal in appearance to metropolitan dailies that it is not obvious the content is produced by young students whose

views of the current scene are neither informed, balanced nor tempered by experience. Any attempt to control the content will bring cries of 'Censorship!'[5]

The annoyance administrators feel toward their student newspapers perpetuates the perception that these student produced papers contain reporting and writing inferior to that of professional publications. However, some research suggests this is not the case. Bodle examined news writing from six Midwestern communities, each with a student daily and a city daily. While he found significant differences in readability, he found no differences in interest levels or story thoroughness including inclusion of fact, detail and reaction sentences, number of sources used and story length.[6] Another study that examined the origin of errors in stories in both student and professional newspapers from the sources' perspectives found that news sources said significantly more inaccuracies occurred in student newspapers. Male reporters at student newspapers were more likely than their female counterparts to make mistakes.[7]

Participants in the National Seminar on Successful College Administration in 1989 were reminded that administrators at public colleges and universities cannot fire student editors, censor or withdraw financial support because of disagreements in viewpoint. Administrators can express opinions or concerns with letters to the editor and can telephone the editor to request corrections or clarifications.[8]

With no power to fire, censor or withdraw funding, officials recently have turned to tossing thousands of copies of student newspapers in the trash. Deans and students alike have dumped their campus newspapers, and one university president labeled the theft of his campus' newspaper a form of protest.[9] Other campus administrators seem unwillingly to exert authority over their student newspapers, but they expect advisers and student publications boards to do so when appropriate.[10]

Four campus administrators, interviewed about their campus newspapers, stressed cultivating relationships between themselves, as well other administrators, and student journalists. They suggested an open house arrangement in which administrators presented updates on recent changes and gave student journalists an opportunity to get to know them better.[11]

Administrators might exercise a more subtle form of control on their student newspapers–the funding from college/university sources. About 25 percent of student publications receive some kind of funding from their institutions, and about 46 percent answer to some administrative officer or publications board.[12] Bodle, however, found in a recent study that only 12 percent of student newspaper advisers saw a link between administrative funding and news content. Administrative requests not to publish certain content fell on deaf ears, as only four percent of advisers said they had complied.[13] Other research reported that about 40 percent of college student newspaper advisers who participated in a survey said they

would quit because of administrative pressure over news content decisions, and 20 percent said they actually experienced such pressure.[14]

Administrators may be further confounded by the argument over the pre-publication review of news stories among academic and professional journalists. Traditionally journalists do not allow sources to review stories before they are published, even in the face of pressure to check facts and cover all the bases. To avoid any suggestion of pre-publication censorship, journalists do not allow sources to review stories.

Outsiders may find the no pre-publication review rule silly. Journalists, after all, are vulnerable to a variety of errors working as they do under deadline pressure. But as Fedler points out, editors continue to enforce the policy because such reviews would take too much time, and sources could offer judgments rather than point out factual errors.[15]

Still, some sources do get an opportunity to check stories. Science writers frequently avail their stories to sources to check technical details and discrete data. However, journalists or academicians, who suggest that other reporters could benefit from pre-publication review, get no overwhelming acclamation. When an official of Investigative Reporters and Editors wrote about the benefits of pre-publication review in *The Quill* in 1990,[16] one journalism professor endorsed the idea and another shot it down.[17] "Pre-publication review is so inherently limited, selective, and dangerous, that it is folly to adopt it as a policy," the dissenter wrote.[18]

A few researchers have tried to determine the cause of inaccuracies in news stories. Lawrence and Grey found that sources and reporters both cited insufficient background information on the part of the reporter as the main reason for errors.[19] Blankenburg found that the relationship between source and reporter affected the perception of errors. If the relationship between the two were close, the less likely an error was perceived by the source.[20] Marshall found that sources' perceptions of errors was similar between competing newspapers in the same city. Errors of omission were most frequent and followed by misquotation, typographic and spelling errors, inaccurate headlines, overemphasis, underemphasis, and wrong names, figures, titles, ages, addresses, locations, times and dates.[21] An earlier study by Berry also found the most frequently claimed errors were omissions, misquotations, other errors of meaning and typographical errors.[22]

Barkin and Levy's study of two elite newspapers, *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, found that these newspapers, who have a reputation of admitting and correcting errors, actually only correct certain types. ~~Errors corrected~~ included (in descending order of frequency) wrong descriptions, names, numbers, explanations, dates, typos and spelling, locations, times, titles and addresses. These newspapers were less likely to admit subjective errors in omissions, under or overemphasis, misquotes or misleading headlines.[23]

Editors may perceive that their newspapers make few mistakes. In Cranberg's survey of 24 dailies that conducted accuracy checks, 15 said that 90 percent of their stories were error free, while the nine remaining said their stories were 80 percent error free. Cranberg thought that sources may give different answers to editors about accuracy than to someone else. He replicated a *Des Moines Register* accuracy survey under the auspices of a university professor and found a significant difference in the error rate. While the *Register* had found an error rate of 14 percent, the university survey found a rate of 63 percent.[24]

Meyer, while not downplaying basic research into the kinds and sources of inaccuracy, advocated quantifying errors as the only way for newspapers to monitor accuracy. He suggested four methods to test accuracy that he had found to be workable.[25]

Kennedy returned to pre-publication correction in the most recent research on newspaper accuracy. As managing editor of the Columbia, Mo., *Missourian*, he said his reporters are instructed to check every story for accuracy by recontacting sources and confirming with them the accuracy of facts and direct quotes before the story is published. Sources listen to enough of the story to make comments or sometimes read the story for themselves. All respondents (n=16/38) to a questionnaire sent by the *Missourian* in 1992, said they liked the accuracy-check policy, and two-thirds said the policy made them more likely to agree to give information to a *Missourian* reporter again. All respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "A newspaper that is accurate is more important to me than getting a newspaper that has stories as soon as they break."[26]

Previous research has apparently not examined the views of college and university administrators as news sources for stories in student-produced campus newspapers. Keeping in mind Charnley's hope for "a reliable body of data concerning newspaper dependability,"[27] and Stempel's suggestion that more study needs to be done on campus administrators' responses to the student press, we conducted a nation-wide survey of administrators at public and private institutions to examine their views on being sources in student stories.[28]

Method

The researchers used all of the 405 colleges and universities listed in the 1994-95 AEJMC Directory that offered journalism or mass communications courses. Five college or university administrators (president, vice president of student affairs, dean of arts and sciences, vice president of academic affairs, and vice president of public relations/public information) were identified at each institution to receive a questionnaire. A mailing list of the five administrators at each of the 405 institutions was compiled to provide the researchers with a population of 2,025 potential respondents. The researchers used a systematic random sample to select every other officer on the list until 1,012 were drawn, then they proceeded to draw every other officer from the remainder until 488 more were drawn for a total of 1,500 administrators.

All respondents remained anonymous but were asked to identify their titles, the names of their offices, their institutions' status as either public or private, their enrollments and region.

The questionnaires were mailed in October 1995. Because of limited funding, the researchers used only one round of mailing. By January 1996, 549 questionnaires or 37 percent, had been returned. However, 39 questionnaires were not included in the final tabulation because they did not include demographic information or they were not answered by an administrator. Therefore, the usable completion rate was 34 percent. This rate may reflect the fact that some administrators at colleges and universities included in this study have very limited offerings in journalism and mass communications and may have chosen not to respond.

The questionnaire contained 21 single and multi-part questions. Eight of the questions asked the respondents to rate problems in stories published in their student newspapers, their level of interest in being news sources for student reporters, the performance of student reporters' in their most recent interview, their satisfaction with published stories, the tone of comments on stories, the editor and reporters' reception of comments from administrators and their overall satisfaction of their experience with student reporters. An interval scale from one to five (one equaled not satisfied, no problem, negative or not interested; and five equaled very satisfied, major problem, positive or very interested) for these ratings. Additional questions requested information on how often they were contacted, how frequently they had news for a student reporter, how frequently they agreed to be sources, what type of news they had, if they had news media guidelines, when they last served as a source, who initiated the story for which they were last a source, whether they communicated with the editor or student reporter after the story was published, if and from whom they heard comments, and whether they had ever refused to do an interview with a student reporter.

The researchers used face validity to pretest the questionnaire. Fifty administrators at or above the dean level at a major university in the southwest were mailed a questionnaire. Thirty (67 percent) of the administrators completed and returned usable questionnaires. The researchers made minor corrections to the instrument regarding the reporters' reliance on telephone interviews as opposed to face-to-face interviews. All the data from the pretest were confidential and were not used again. None of the data was included in the study's final analyses.

Analysis of Data

Out of 1,500 questionnaires mailed to the sample of respondents, 510 usable questionnaires were returned for a return rate of 34 percent. Respondents represented 334 public (65.5 percent) and 176 private (34.5 percent) colleges or universities.

Colleges and universities from all parts of the United States were represented including 30 percent from the North Central Region, 12 percent from the Northeast, 41 percent from the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

South, and 17 percent from the West. (See Table 1.)[29] These percentages closely matched the population of colleges and universities listed in the AEJMC directory. Of the 405 colleges and universities in the directory, 31 percent were from the South, 17 percent were from the West, 37 percent were from the North and 15 percent were from the Northeast. In addition, a variety of enrollments were represented: about 2 percent from institutions under 999; 48 percent from 1,000-9,999; 30 percent from 10,000-19,999; and 20 percent from 20,000 or more. (See Table 2.)

The respondents included 80 presidents or their assistants, 37 provosts, 21 chancellors, 113 deans, 143 vice presidents, and 116 directors, assistant directors or chairs. About 24 percent of the respondents were affiliated with student affairs, and 23 percent were affiliated with public relations/public information offices. About 15.5 percent were from presidents offices, followed by arts and sciences with 13.5 percent and academic affairs with 13 percent. Other officers including those with the title of provost, vice president, chancellor, dean of the college or other amounted to 11 percent. (See Table 3.)

Forty-eight percent (n=224) of the respondents were contacted frequently about one to two times a month to be sources. Another 26 percent were contacted regularly, at least once a week, while about 26 percent were seldom or never contacted. (See Table 4.) Sixty percent of the provosts and vice presidents said they were frequent sources (n=21/35), as did deans of the college (n=5/8). Presidents or their assistants reported frequently being asked to be sources about 57 percent of the time (n=45/79), followed by the heads of student affairs, 49.5 percent (n=61/123); academic affairs, 47 percent; public relations about 45 percent (n=53/119). Academic deans, such as deans of arts and sciences, reported being frequent sources about 35 percent of the time (n=24/69), and other academic officers, such as heads of institutional research, about 27 percent (n-31/66). Included in the group of seldom or never contacted were deans of arts and sciences and other academic officers such as vice presidents of institutional research. (See Table 5.)

About 55 percent of the respondents had a news story or a news release for a student reporter either frequently (1-2 times a month) or regularly (at least once a week). About 45 percent said they seldom or never had news.

When asked to be a news source, nearly 77 percent of the respondents said they always agreed to do it (n=392/510). Only seven percent said they agreed to be a source only if they had the time, and 16 percent said they would serve as sources under certain circumstances such as considering themselves to be the appropriate source.

Eighty-three percent said they would have a basic news story to give to their student reporters; 41 percent said they would have an announcement and 36 percent said they would have a feature story.

Respondents rated a series of problems they experienced in an article about themselves or for which they were sources. A five-point interval scale was used to measure the problem level. A rating of five meant a major problem, and a rating of one meant no problem. Six of the seven problems that the respondents were asked to rate were considered a problem at some level. (See Table 6.) Over emphasis of the unique (2.2 mean) and use of humor (1.5 mean) were the only two that fell in the low range. Respondents viewed unwarranted elaboration (2.49 mean), misleading headlines (2.9 mean), being quoted out of context (2.9 mean), misstatement of facts (3.0 mean), and omitted information (3.2 mean) as mid-range problems.

Respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with their most recent interview by a student reporter (See Table 7). A five-point interval scale was used to assess level of satisfaction with one being not satisfied and five being very satisfied. Respondents said they were satisfied (mean=3.576, Std. Dev. 1.021). However, there was no apparent relationship between their interest in being interviewed and the frequency of being asked to be a source (X^2=19.883, DF=12, p=.0693.)

A majority, 68. 5 percent, of the respondents reported that guidelines were in place in their offices concerning who is responsible for speaking to the news media. About 45 percent said their institution's public relations department had created the guidelines, while another 40 percent said they had created their own. Seventy-eight percent also said the guidelines were created as a good practice and not because of a previous story in the student newspaper, a crisis or someone serving as a source who should not have.

About 27 percent of the respondents said they had been interviewed by a student reporter the week before answering the questionnaire, and 25 percent said they had been interviewed during the current week. Another 22 percent said they had been interviewed in the current month. More than 90 percent of the respondents said the student reporter had initiated the interview, as opposed to the respondent initiating it. The respondents also said they were interested in being interviewed (mean=3.5, Std. Dev.=1.011).

Respondents were asked to rate the actions of the student reporters during their most recent interviews. Using a five-point interval scale with five being excellent and one being poor, the respondents evaluated the reporters' preparation, objectivity, questions, knowledge of the topics and post-publication verification (See Table 8). They gave high ratings for the reporters' objectivity (3.6 mean) and for asking pertinent questions (3.6 mean), mid-range marks for preparation (3.3 mean), for follow-up questions (2.9 mean) and for knowledge about the topic (2.8 mean), and low marks for calling back to verify information (1.9 mean) or calling back to get a post-publication reaction (1.4 mean).

Respondents reported mild satisfaction with published stories resulting from interviews with student reporters (mean=3.386, Std. Dev.=1.024). (See Table 7.)

Less than a quarter of the respondents said they communicated with the editor or the student reporter after the story was published (n=108/480). Of those, 41 percent spoke to the editor or reporter in person and 44 percent spoke to the individual by telephone. Only 81 respondents recorded their reasons for communicating with the editor or student reporter. Of those, 67 percent did so to compliment. Ninety-three respondents recorded the reception they received when they talked to the editor or reporter as good (mean 3.9) on a five-point interval scale with 5 being excellent and being poor. About half (n=261/460) said they did hear comments from others. Several respondents (n=195) said they received between one and ten comments with the mean being 5.8. Most of the comments came from peers. (See Table 9.)The comments they received were rated negative only six percent of the time, and on the five-point scale the mean was 3.35.

Three-fourths of the respondents said the had never refused to do an interview with a student reporter (n=506). They did not rate their total experience with the student reporters of their campus newspapers either extremely high or extremely low. The mean was 3.359. (See Table 7.) There was a relationship between the frequency of being contacted to be a source and the administrators' rating of their total experiences (X^2=25.532, DF=12, p=.0125). (See Table 10.)

Discussion and Conclusions

This survey of 510 college and university administrators at both public and private institutions across the United States indicates a high amount of cooperation between the administrators and their student reporters. Almost three-fourths of the respondents are contacted frequently or regularly to be sources, and nearly 77 percent said they always agree to be a source when asked. Furthermore, 75 percent said they had never refused to do an interview with a student reporter. Most respondents had been sources within the same month as they answered the questionnaire. They reported having some interest in being interviewed (3.5 mean).While there was no apparent relationship between interest in being interviewed and the frequency of being asked to be a source, a relationship did emerge between the frequency of being contacted to be a source and the administrators' rating of their total experiences with student reporters.The more frequently they were asked, the more satisfactorily the administrators rated their experiences.

The college and university administrators who answered the questionnaire did not rate student reporters and their efforts either negatively or positively. Instead, they tended to rate them in the middle range. They gave the highest rating (3.576 mean) to their level of satisfaction with their most recent interviews. They rated their level of satisfaction with the published stories resulting from their most recent interviews and with their total experience with student reporters with means of 3.4 each.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Administrators gave the student reporters above average ratings in only two areas: for their objectivity (3.6 mean) and for asking pertinent questions (3.6 mean). The ratings they assigned in other areas, however, indicated some room for improvement. For example they gave student reporters mid-range ratings for interview preparation (3.3 mean), follow-up questions (2.9 mean) and for knowledge about the topic (2.8 mean); and low-range ratings for calling back to verify information (1.9 mean) or calling back to get a post-publication reaction (1.4 mean).

In rating seven problems in an article about the administrator or for which the administrator was a source, the administrators on the average did not reveal any as major problems. However, at least five of the areas were rated in the middle and could be viewed as problems. These were misstatements of facts and omitted information, 3.0 and 3.2 respectively on the five-point scale with one being no problem and five being a major problem; being quoted out of context and misleading headlines with means of 2.9 each, and unwarranted elaboration (2.5 mean). Over emphasis of the unique (2.2 mean) could be viewed as a minor problem and use of humor as no problem (1.5 mean).

The results of this survey offer some support of the literature. Blankenburg found insufficient background information on the part of the reporter as the main reason for errors in news stories. Administrators in this survey rated the reporters' knowledge of the topic with a mean of 2.8, or in the middle range of a five-point scale with five being excellent and one being poor.

Blankenburg also found that the relationship between source and reporter affected the perception of errors. Administrators are apparently willing to participate in interviews by student reporters from their campuses, and they rated their level of satisfaction with their most recent interviews at a mean of 3.576.

Misstatements of fact, omitted information, being quoted out of context and misleading headlines (all with means in the mid-range of 3) were considered the greatest problems in articles about the administrator or for which the administrator was a source, agreeing in part with Marshall and Berry's findings on errors in news stories.The results also give some support for the pre-publication checking discussed by Weinberg and Kennedy. Student reporters got the lowest ratings of all for calling back campus administrative sources to either verify information (1.9 mean) or to get a post-publication reaction (1.4 mean).

Many of the findings from this study have implications for teaching news writing and for advising students working at campus newspapers. Student reporters apparently need to improve their interviewing and follow-up techniques.

This survey represents what is apparently a first in that the literature reports no previous study of college and university administrators' reactions to serving as sources for student

reporters. Although it is limited by the number of respondents, it does indicate pertinent information on the performance of student reporters and the level of satisfaction administrators have with their experiences as news sources.

In addition to college and university administrators, other campus sources should be queried as to their experiences in serving as sources for student reporters. A larger response rate may provide clearer deficiencies or accomplishments.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1
Location of Administrators' Colleges and Universities

Region	Percent	N
North	30.20	154
Northeast	12.16	62
South	40.78	208
West	16.83	86

Table 2
Enrollments of Administrators' Colleges and Universities

Enrollment	Percent	N
1-999	1.77	9
1,000-9,999	48.63	248
10,000-19,999	30.00	153
20,000 or more	19.60	100

Table 3
Title of Respondent's Office

Title	Percent	N
President	15.49	80
Public Relations/Info.	23.33	119
Academic Affairs	12.94	66
Other Academic	2.16	11
Student Affairs	24.12	122
Provost/VP/Chancellor	6.86	35
Dean of College	1.57	8
Dean, Arts & Sciences, or Similar	13.53	69

Table 4
Administrators' Frequency of Being News Sources

Frequency	Percent	N
Never	1.37	7
Seldom	24.51	125
Frequently	47.65	243
Regularly	26.47	135

Table 5
Frequency of Contacting Administrators by Student Reporters

Office	Never	Seldom	Frequently	Regularly
President	0	12.66	56.96	30.38
Public Relations	2.52	15.97	44.54	36.97
Other Academic	3.03	33.33	46.97	16.67
Student Affairs	.81	14.63	49.59	34.96
Provost/VP/Chancellor	0	11.43	60.0	28.57
Dean of College	12.5	25.0	62.5	0
Dean Arts & Sciences or Similar	0	65.22	34.78	0

Percentages=Row Percentages
N=510

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6
Administrators' Ratings of Problems in Student Reporters' Stories

Problem	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
Omitted Info	15.3	26.0	29.2	20.8	8.7	3.185	1.181	438
Misstated facts	11.7	20.8	34.9	21.9	10.6	3.001	1.15	452
Misleading Head	14.3	19.7	26.9	23.5	15.5	2.938	1.276	405
Quote Out/Context	13.6	22.5	23.5	24.9	15.6	2.936	1.28	405
Unwarranted Elab.	6.9	15.5	22.9	28.5	26.0	2.488	1.225	361
Over Emphasis	4.7	10.9	21.1	23.6	39.8	2.171	1.199	322
Use of Humor	2.3	2.3	7.2	15.6	72.5	1.464	.902	302

5=major problem; 1=no problem

Table 7
Administrators' Ratings

Rating	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	s	N
Most Recent Interview	19.1	36.5	30.9	9.8	3.6	3.58	1.02	498
Interest in Being Interviewed	16.7	35.7	32.9	11.1	3.6	3.5	1.01	504
Published Stories	11.3	34.1	37.4	11.3	4.9	3.39	1.02	487
Total Experience with Student Reporters	8.7	36.7	39.3	12.5	2.8	3.36	.908	496

5=Very Satisfied; 1=Not Satisfied

Table 8
Administrators' Ratings of Student Reporters' Actions

Reporter's Actions	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	s	N
Maintained Objectivity	20.0	40.3	26.9	8.9	3.8	3.64	1.02	494
Asked Pertinent Questions	18.3	37.2	31.8	9.1	3.6	3.58	1.01	497
Advance Prep.	15.3	31.9	27.4	15.1	10.3	3.27	1.19	497
Asked Follow-up Questions	9.6	23.7	31.3	20.5	14.9	2.93	1.19	489
Knowledgeable/ Topic	7.9	17.5	37.1	24.4	13.1	2.83	1.11	491
Called back/verify	5.1	9.3	11.8	19.1	54.8	1.91	1.22	451
Called back/reaction	4.3	3.2	5.0	5.9	81.5	1.43	1.03	438

5=Excellent; 1=Poor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 9
Source of Comments Heard by Administrators

Comments	Percent	N
Peers	.95	225
Staff	.97	190
Public	.88	56
Regents	.73	26
Parents	.58	19
Students	.96	96
Other Adm.	.53	14
Others	.60	15

Table 10
Frequency of Being Contacted to Be Source
by Administrators Total Experience with Student Newspaper

	Not Interested	2	3	4	Very Interested	Totals
Never	0	2	2	1	1	6
Seldom	8	19	54	34	8	123
Frequently	6	28	96	90	17	237
Regularly	0	13	43	57	17	130
Totals	14	62	195	182	43	496

X^2=25.532
DF=12
p=.0125

End Notes

[1]Billy Gibson, "News Coverage Patterns in College Dailies," *College Media Review*, Winter 1991, 16, 17.

[2]Mark Moore, "News Gathering: Knowing Sources is Vital, on a Base or on a Campus," *College Media Review*, Summer/Fall 1992, 25.

[3]See for example, Carolyn Martindale, "Student Newspapers Need Not be a Nuisance," *Educational Record*, Winter, 1983, 46-49; Michael W. Hirschorn, "Here's a Student-Run Newspaper That's Unabashedly Sexist, Elitist, and Obnoxious," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 15, 1987, 37-38; Lawrence Biemiller, "Vitriolic Student Paper Is Causing Lasting Harm, Many at Dartmouth Say," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Feb. 8, 1989, 14-15.

[4]Peter T. Flawn, *A Primer for Presidents: Managing the Modern University*, (Austin, Texas, University of Texas Press, 1990), 100.

[5]*Ibid.*

[6]John V. Bodle, "The Quality of News in Student Newspapers: Is It as Good as the Cross-town Community Daily?" *College Media Review*, Winter/Spring 1993, 34, 35.

[7]Ed Adams, John V. Bodle, and Robert Nanney, "A Study of Accuracy Perception between Sources and Reporters in Student and Community Newspapers," *College Media Review*, Winter/Spring 1993, 33.

[8]Betsy B. Cook "The Administrator and the College Press: Strategies for a Successful Relationship," paper presented at the National Seminar on Successful College Administration, Orlando, Florida, February, 1989.

[9]Paul McMasters, "Trashing the Press," *College Media Review*, Summer 1994, 14-16.

[10]John Jasinski, "As They See It...College Newspapers May Not Look the Same to Campus Administrators," *College Media Review*, Summer 1994, 8-11.

[11]*Ibid.*, p. 10.

[12]Lillian Lodge Kopenhaver and Ronald E. Spielberger, "Small Media Operations Predominate on Campuses," College Media Review, Winter/Spring 1992, 30; and "Advisers Post Some Gains, Fewer Losses," College Media Review, Summer/Fall 1991, 21.

[13]John V. Bodle, "Measuring the Tie Between Funding and News Control at Student Newspapers," *Journalism Quarterly*, 71 (Winter 1994):905-913.

[14]John V. Bodle, "Why Newspaper Advisers Quit: Stress and Professional Prestige," *Journalism Educator*, Autumn 1993, 35.

[15]Fred Fedler, *Reporting for the Print Media*, (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1993) 128.

[16]Steve Weinberg, "So What's Wrong with Pre-publication Review?" *The Quill*, May 1990, 26-27.

[17]See John Demott, "Let Them Read It," letter to the editor of *The Quill*, Vol. 78, No. 6, July/August 1990, 5; and Herb Strentz, "Just Say No to Pre-publication Review," letter to the editor of *The Quill*, Vol. 78, No. 7, September 1990, 4.

[18]Strentz, *Op. Cit.*

[19]Gary C. Lawrence and David L. Grey,"Subjective Inaccuracies in Local News Reporting," Journalism Quarterly, 46:753-757 (1969).

[20]William B. Blankenburg, "News Accuracy: Some Findings on the Meaning of Errors," *Journal of Communication*, 20:375-386 (1970).

[21]Hal Marshall, "Newspaper Accuracy in Tucson," *Journalism Quarterly*, 55:165-1685 (1977).

[22]Fred C. Berry Jr., "A Study of Accuracy in Local News Stories of Three Dailies," *Journalism Quarterly*, 44:482-490 (1967).

[23]Steven M. Barkin and Mark R. Levy, "All the News That's Fit to Correct: Corrections in the *Times* and the *Post*," *Journalism Quarterly*, 60:218-225 (1983).

[24]Gilbert Cranberg, "Do Accuracy Checks Really Measure What Respondents Think About News Stories?" *The Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors*, 697:14-15 (July/August 1987).

[25]Philip Meyer, "A Workable Measure of Auditing Accuracy in Newspapers," *Newspaper Research Journal*, 10:39-51 (Fall, 1988).

[26]George Kennedy, "Newspaper Accuracy: A New Approach," *Newspaper Research Journal*, 15:55-62 (Winter, 1994)

[27]Mitchell Charnley, "Preliminary Notes on a Study of Newspaper Accuracy," *Journalism Quarterly*, December 1936, 394

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[28]Guido H. Stempel III, "Research Needs of the College Press," *College Press Review*, Summer 1979, 4-6; and as cited in Bodle, "Measuring the Tie Between Funding and News Control at Student Newspapers," *Journalism Quarterly*, 71:905-913 (Winter 1994).

[29]States were divided into four categories according to the Census Bureau divisions as listed in the Associated Press Stylebook. The North Central Region included Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska North Dakota, and South Dakota. The Northeast Region included Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. The South Region included Washington, D.C., Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas. The West Region included Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington.